

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

### Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In this reply, independent claims 12 and 15 are being amended to recite that the payment units are “stored on a storage device.” Support for the amendments can be found at least in Fig. 2 and pages 11- 13 of the specification. Those claims now recite a physical object and transformation of the data representing payment units on the physical object. For at least above reasons, claims 12-15 are believed to be statutory.

### Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,949,880 (“Curry et al.”) in view of Kingdon et al. further in view of Teicher and yet further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,988,497 (“Wallace”). Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,949,880 (“Curry et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,193 (“Kingdom et al.”) further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,946 (“Teicher”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For instance, those references whether taken alone or in combination do not disclose or suggest at least, “splitting a parent payment unit having a given non-minimum parent monetary value into a plurality of child payment units each having a child monetary value smaller than the parent value, the sum of child monetary values being the same as the parent monetary value,”

claimed in independent claim 5 and similarly claimed in independent claims 12 and 15. While conceding that neither Curry et al. nor Kingdon et al. teaches that element, the Examiner cites Teicher for that proposition, specifically, Teicher's column 26, lines 59-67 and column 27, lines 1-10.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Those sections of Teicher explicitly state, inter alia, "card-to-card transactions are limited according to the electronic coins actually stored in both cards, thus a parent having a card of FIG. 17 currently having only two \$5 electronic coins, will be able to transfer to his child's card currently storing a single \$1 electronic coin, only an amount of \$4, \$5, \$9 or \$10." As understood by applicants, that description says that the parent having two \$5 electronic coins cannot be split or joined, hence transfer can only occur in the amount of \$4 (i.e., transfer one \$5 electronic coin to child's card and transfer back the single \$1 electronic coin from the child's card into the parent's card), \$5 (i.e., transfer one \$5 electronic coin to child's card), \$9 (i.e., transfer two \$5 electronic coin to child's card and transfer back the single \$1 electronic coin from the child's card into the parent's card), or \$10 (i.e., transfer two \$5 electronic coin to child's card). Further, the reference to the terms "parent" and "child" in Teicher is to real family relationship – e.g., father to son. The cited passage of Teicher is describing a scenario in which a parent (e.g., a father) gives money (via card transaction) to his child (son or daughter). That passage does not disclose or suggest a monetary value being split into smaller values as claimed in independent claims of the present application – i.e., parent monetary value being the one that is being split and the child monetary value being a value that is split into.

The Examiner also cites the same Teicher's sections as allegedly disclosing "joining a plurality of single payment units having a given total monetary value into a joined payment unit

having a corresponding same monetary value,” claimed in independent claims 5, 12 and 15. As discussed above, those sections do not disclose splitting, let alone joining.

For at least the above reasons and because Wallace also does not make up for which Curry et al., Kingdon et al. and Teicher lack, independent claims 5, 12 and 15 and their respective dependent claims are not obvious over the cited references.

While the above reasons suffice to overcome the rejections, those references alone or in combination also do not disclose or suggest, “excluding said one or more payment units having a monetary value smaller than a predetermined value from inheriting age information, said means for transferring a respective age information further excluding said one or more payment units that have exceeded a predetermined change threshold age level from a split or join process” claimed in claim 5 and similarly claimed in claims 12 and 15. The Examiner cites Curry et al.’s Fig. 5, steps Y10-Y13 and column 9, lines 3-12. Those passages as understood by applicants describe adding monetary value to a portable device from an ATM, incrementing a transaction count after adding the amount. Unlike the Examiner’s interpretation, those passages do not disclose or suggest “excluding said one or more payment units having a monetary value smaller than a predetermined value from inheriting age information, said means for transferring a respective age information further excluding said one or more payment units that have exceeded a predetermined change threshold age level from a split or join process.”

For at least the above additional reasons, independent claims 5, 12 and 15 are further unobvious over the cited references. For the same additional reasons, their dependent claims at least by virtue of dependency are not obvious over the cited references.

This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and every effort has been made to place the application in condition for allowance. A favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Eunhee Park

Registration No.: 42,976

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
EP:vh